

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Mon Nov 21 02:42:08 1994
Date: Sun, 20 Nov 94 21:20:32 PST
From: dh@deneb.csustan.edu (Doug Hendricks)
Message-Id: <9411210520.AA23405@deneb.csustan.edu>
Subject: Epiphyte Kits

I picked up the 10 Murata Filters for the Epiphyte from Derry last weekend, and I have put together some parts kits for the Epiphyte 75M SSB transceiver by Derry Spittle, VE7QK, that was featured in the Sept. issue of QRPp.

These kits consist of the PC Board, drilled and plated from Far Circuits, all board mounted parts except for the 4.19 MHz resonator, which you do not need if you are going to put a vfo with the rig. The rig covers 3.725 - 3.775 with the resonator, not exactly prime territory for the US hams. See the Dec. issue of QRPp for a simple vfo circuit plus pboard layout that will allow you to put the Epiphyte anywhere you want to on the 75 meter band. The mox terminals and headers are included.

All you need to put the rig on the air is a case, microphone, air variable for C5, simple vfo, antenna connector, power connector, speaker or phones, and 12 volt supply.

The kit cost is \$80 US funds, delivered in the US and Canada. There are only 10 kits for sale, and I will sell to the first ten who contact me. Send email and get a confirmation before you send your money. If you send a check or money order, make it out to Doug Hendricks. My address is:

Doug Hendricks, KI6DS
862 Frank Ave
Dos Palos, CA 93620

72, Doug KI6DS

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Mon Nov 21 02:49:29 1994
Date: Sun, 20 Nov 1994 23:45:11 -0600 (CST)
From: Adrian Weiss W0RSP English Department <AWEISS@charlie.usd.edu>
Message-Id: <941120234511.130a2@charlie.usd.edu>
Subject: RE: hw8 mods

Richard:

My reprints of my series of articles on the HW-8 are still available at \$10 first class. Includes original test report (CQ Mag), and two mods articles ("Super-modified HW-8 Contest Machine") plus a few other shorter pieces. Mods include RIT (the best design published), conversion of meter to Breune in-line wattmeter/SWR bridge, 15m receiver sensitivity mod, speaker and a few others.

QTH: 526 N. Dakota St., Vermillion, SD 57069
73, Ade Weiss

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sun Nov 20 18:24:07 1994

From: NYOUNG@nova.wright.edu
Date: Sun, 20 Nov 1994 16:26:34 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Let's try this again about RSTs and S-meters and other stuff
Message-Id: <01HJPIXW9R548ZFIX0@nova.wright.edu>

And moreover....

All this talk about s-meters and signal strengths and RST reports and radios without s-meters being whatever they are reminded me of two things. The first was, easily enough, my first receiver. It was a Heath SB-310 (the swl version of the SB-301). It had a meter, but I never figured out how to use it and just let it sit there on the front panel and wiggle at me.

The second memory was a conversation -- with notes -- that some of my friends and I had during a class about grading student papers. The process of grading -- like giving signal reports -- appears to most to be highly subjective. We came up with some points and questions:

- >> Does a grade really tell anyone anything?
 Grades measure only small ranges of ability, those ranges being decided upon, more often than not, by the teacher whose position becomes that of observer.
- >> Asking for grades is asking for inaccurate feedback because grades are really comments about work done.
- >> For many students, not having a grade on the paper is like having nothing else to look at. No grade means that the work appears to have been done in vain. Students, like most of us, want to feel that their work means something. This is the result of a societal convention of establishing hierarchies of power, skill, knowledge and outright stamina.
- >> Ultimately, grading appears to involve my asking the student to do something that she or he has never done before and then saying that I'll measure how much the student fails.

If we apply the same considerations to RSTs and s-meter readings, it becomes pretty obvious pretty quick that we're just looking for validation of a permission to send a signal. If we are heard at all, we feel that the hours spent bent over a board with a soldering iron in our hands were hours well-spent. The more easily we are heard, the better we feel. But it's important to remember that it is not just our skill as builders, designers or modifiers that gets us the validating signal report. We are also dealing with wires in the air, clouds of ionized oxygen and the amount of pigeon dung that is crusted between one side of the insulator and the other. S-meters, like the people who design the

circuits which drive them, are subjective beasts that operate on the basis of cold physics. The fact that all of us, ultimately, are part of those cold operations of physics slips past us and we find ourselves listing 579(!) in our logs with a sense of smug satisfaction on our faces.

It's simply this: we all wanna be loved, even by the laws of the universe that we play with every time we flip the power switch to "on." And sometimes we get lucky.

73

Nils

WB8IJN &c

"Now junior, you know how we feel about people who can't suppress their food barks."

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sun Nov 20 13:47:25 1994

From: NYOUNG@nova.wright.edu

Date: Sun, 20 Nov 1994 11:45:40 -0400 (EDT)

Subject: Modifications for SSB: D.J.'s suggestion reconsidered

Message-Id: <01HJP94006768ZFNDD@nova.wright.edu>

Y'all,

As a linguist, I saw D.J.'s comment about ESL/SL first and missed entirely his questions about the NN1G and an SSB transceiver. Only after I'd slept off a bunch of Vygotsky meditations did it come to me that his question about SSB is not just interesting but also important.

I woke up with the realization that any number of superhet kits around could be modified to run SSB. For example, the NW8020 in the September QRPP could be modified to run SSB if, instead of the CO circuit in the TX mixer, an external SSB signal (generated in a circuit similar to the RX mixer) were injected at pin 6 of the NE602 there. Of course, the RX signal would have to be muted and the TX amp circuits would need modification.

For the average non-engineer person, this kind of modification would be like an engineer trying to reconcile the contradictory data in the relationship between Japanese and the other Altaic languages. Personally, I'd love to see a circuit that could be added to, say, the NW8020 to turn it into an SSB rig.

Maybe D.J.'s just the guy to do it.

Of course, when he succeeds, we'll all have to pay up for the board(s) and warm up the soldering iron. And I'll have to get a new prescription for my bifocals. Either that or have my seven-year-old build it for me. But first I have to teach him to read the resistor code.

73

Nils

WB8IJN

"Now junior, you know how we feel about people who can't suppress their food barks."

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sun Nov 20 14:20:14 1994

Date: Sun, 20 Nov 1994 13:48:48 -0330 (NST)

From: Robert Gobrick <bgobrick@random.ucs.mun.ca>

Subject: QRP Christmas Shopping

Message-Id: <Pine.3.87.9411201348.A12472-0100000@random.ucs.mun.ca>

Santa asked me to poll the QRP-L for a used copy of the book "Joy of QRP" by W0RSP. This book will be a Christmas gift for a deserving QRPer (me) and Santa's helper (my wife) said she would pay the new price for this cherished gift. Please leave a private Email for me if anyone has any leads on this book.

72 Bob V01DRB/WA6ERB

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Mon Nov 21 00:06:22 1994

From: dwebster@netcom.com (Dennis Webster)

Message-Id: <199411210414.UAA11151@netcom3.netcom.com>

Subject: Re: QRP Christmas Shopping

Date: Sun, 20 Nov 1994 20:14:55 -0800 (PST)

>

> Santa asked me to poll the QRP-L for a used copy of the book "Joy of QRP"
> by W0RSP. This book will be a Christmas gift for a deserving QRPer (me)
> and Santa's helper (my wife) said she would pay the new price for this
> cherished gift. Please leave a private Email for me if anyone has any
> leads on this book.

>

> 72 Bob V01DRB/WA6ERB

>

>

Is that in today's dollars, or 1985 dollars adjusted for inflation. :-)
However, I just can't bring myself to part with my copy. Maybe there
will be a reprint someday!
Good luck in your search
Dennis

--

```
|Dennis Webster WJ6H/QRP          * LESS IS MORE! *|
|dwebster@netcom.com              |
|-----|
```

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sun Nov 20 10:32:46 1994
Message-Id: 19941120.082744.ATXR@CENVMC
Date: 20 Nov 94 08:27:44 EXT
From: ATXR@CENVMC.CENCOL.ON.CA
Subject: rst-another comment

>From: Ted Rosen, Architectural Technology Department
I've been following the discussion regarding "how" to determine
accurately(?) rst during a qrp qso. I've only noted a couple of
vague comments to "why" use rst, which I think is perhaps more
useful. Whether one uses a meter or a subjective basis for reporting
rst, I would think is a personal preference (that is unless you don't
have a meter on the rig) The bottom line is that I would like to know
how well the other station is receiving my signals, and I would like the
other station to know how well I am receiving theirs. If I send or receive
a report greater than 559, there seems to be no reason to limit the
length or content of the transmission. If the station reports less than
559, qsb, qrm, or qrn, I try to limit the length of transmission, and
keep the message as simple as possible. I'm sure we have all experienced
another station sending for many minutes when reception is "rough" with
little or no comprehension on the part of the receiving station. I'd like
to think that part of the skill of operating is evaluating when useful
communication can take place and when it is better to try again under
better conditions. This is particularly true under variable conditions
which may start better than 559 and deteriorate from there.
BTW I have received signals using a IC751, where the meter shows
a signal strength of S1, yet the reception is excellent. And I am
generally more concerned when I hear a qro station with a 599+40
splattering into my receiver during a MY qrp chat with another station.
Am I 439 on this?
73 de Ted, VA3TAR

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sun Nov 20 14:12:36 1994
From: NYOUNG@nova.wright.edu
Date: Sun, 20 Nov 1994 11:53:34 -0400 (EDT)

Subject: RSTs, S-meters and, well, you know
Message-Id: <01HJP9CBPSS08ZFNDD@nova.wright.edu>

All this talk about RST and S-meter readings being subjective judgements reminds me of a conversation I had recently about YP(i

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sun Nov 20 06:57:29 1994
Date: Sun, 20 Nov 1994 10:04:44 GMT
From: John@antenna.demon.co.uk (John Garrett)
Message-Id: <1678@antenna.demon.co.uk>
Subject: Ten-Tec Century22 Broadcast QRM

Hi,
Anybody found a cure to broadcast interference on this rig?

I use the C22 at QRP levels and thoroughly enjoy the full QSK operation. Many happy hours with this rig. However, it suffers from what I believe to be direct demodulation of strong broadcast stations around 7 MHz. (I can listen to the BBC World Service at the same time as having a QSO but it plays havoc with weak sigs, hi!) The interference does not tune as I change the VFO.

Ten-Tec call the receiver "double direct-conversion" - i.e. the RX path uses a mixer with a xtal osc before a second mixer with the VFO. Thus it has a tunable 1st IF, which is 6.5-7 MHz. I'm guessing that the BC signals are getting in here.

BTW, I find the full break-in keying to be excellent and am surprised that so few kit rigs use it. Doesn't seem to take many components in the Ten-Tec implementation.

Any other C22 users out there?

72 de John

```
-----  
|      John Garrett      | john@antenna.demon.co.uk |  
| Tel (work):+44 1473 644 280 | Compu$erve: 100064,1370 |  
| Fax (work):+44 1473 644 604 | g3rhp@amsat.org       |  
-----
```

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Sun Nov 20 05:32:26 1994
From: mont@netcom.com (Mont Pierce)
Message-Id: <199411200948.BAA00391@netcom12.netcom.com>
Subject: Re: The fine art of RST
Date: Sun, 20 Nov 1994 01:46:55 -0800 (PST)

>
> All told, then, it appears to me that the components of a signal report are
> subjective at best, whether one relies on the occasional S-meter or not.
>
> Well, then, why put so much emphasis on it? Ultimately, it is meaningless
> because it is the interpretation of the operator (or designer of the meter
> system). I suppose if you work the same station, and the operator is
> consistent in his interpretations, you may be able to get some meaningful
> data.
>
> Other than that, it is, at best, a fuzzy indication of how well you two can
> hear each other.

This could get quite funny... Yes RST reports are subjective, but that does not mean they are meaningless. If you watch a skating contest and 5 judges all give different scores, does that mean that only one of them is right and the other 4 judges are wrong because they didn't give the same report?? Now if one judge always gives the highest score, no matter how good or bad a performance might be, that is a truly worthless score.

Now stop laughing at me! I do not mean to say that we are in a scoring contest trying to beat one another, but it is sort of a contest... An operator with his equipment and skills pitted against distance, sun-spot cycles, and propagation...

So you need to take RST reports with a grain of salt. It's sort of like taking a survey. You throw away the 599 reports you think are bogus, and average the rest. I like one guy's sig on the list, "if RST > 519, then reduce power".

72 es great qrping to u,
km6wt

--

Mont Pierce

```
+-----+
| Ham Call: KM6WT           Internet:  mont@netcom.com |
|   bands: 80/40/20/15/10/2 |
|   modes: cw,ssb,fm        |
+-----+
```